REMARKS

Claims 1-146 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-17, 19-21, 23-45, 49-55, 58-94, 98-104, 107-116, 120-127, and 131-146 stand rejected.

Claims 29, 95, 116, 138 and 146 have been objected to.

Claims 18, 22, 46-48, 56, 57, 95-97, 105, 106, 117-119 and 128-130 have been deemed allowable, subject to Applicants addressing the related issues raised in the Office Action.

Claims 1, 29, 37, 39, 58, 86, 95, 116, 138, 143, 144, and 146 have been amended for clarity.

Claims 107, 131, and 139 have been canceled.

Claim Objections

Claims 29, 95, 116, 138, and 146 are objected to for various informalities.

Claims 29, 95, 116, 138, and 146 have been amended to correct the informalities.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18, 22, 46-48, 56, 57, 95-97, 105, 106, 117-119 and 128-130 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (the allowance is subject to Applicants addressing the related issues raised in the Office Action).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 37 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 37 and 39 have been amended to delete "substantially".

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 107, 131 and 139 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, and specifically for being directed to a "carrier medium".

Claims 107, 131, and 139 have been canceled.

Claim 144 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, and specifically for being directed to "computer apparatus".

Claim 144 has been amended to refer to a "computer programmable medium having code stored therein and executable by a processor for ..."

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

"To anticipate [under 35 U.S.C. § 102], every element and limitation of the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim." *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383, 58 USPQ2d 1286, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

The corollary of that rule is that absence from the reference of any claimed element negates anticipation. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. DuPont De Nemours*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1573, 224 USPQ 409, 411 (Fed.Cir.1984).

I.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-13, 26, 27, 58, 59, 62, 63, 67-70, 83, 84, 107, 108, 141, 142, 144 and 145 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McNeely et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,130,877 (referred to herein as "*McNeely*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 requires "if it is determined that the message should be sent to another service, each service in the predetermined set of services transmitting the message to an appropriate service." *McNeely* teaches that a "server includes means for generating a request object and a response object for each request message received from a data network node in the communications network." *McNeely*, col. 3, lines 29-32. Thus, the "request object" and the "response object" are distinct from the request message. *McNeely* further teaches that at "least one switching component is operable to examine at least one of the request object and the response object in determining at least one of the plurality of request processing modules to which to forward the request and response objects." *Id.*, lines 36-40. Thus, *McNeely* does not teach that the request message is forwarded, but rather teaches that the request object and the response object are forwarded.

Accordingly, *McNeely* does not teach or suggest "if it is determined that the message should be sent to another service, each service in the predetermined set of services transmitting the message to an appropriate service" as required by claim 1.

The foregoing remarks also apply *mutatis mutandis* to claims 58, 108, 141, 142, 144, and 145.

II.

Claim 143 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Croney et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,389,471 (referred to herein as "*Croney*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 143 requires "aggregating user interface data received from a plurality of source applications." *Croney* teaches:

> a server computing system that is in communication with a client system receives a request from the client system for one or more web pages. The one or more requested web pages have preferably been associated with one or more master pages and one or more content endpoint pages that can be merged to form a resultant page that can be rendered by the client system to satisfy the client system request. *Croney*, col. 1, lines 62-67.

Thus, a server computing system merges pages into a resultant page for rendering by the client.

In col. 6, *Croney* teaches further details of using master and end point pages to provide a common format for multiple web pages. However, *Croney* does not teach that the user interface data is "received from a plurality of source applications." *Croney* does not mention the number of source applications.

Additionally, claim 143 requires "aggregating received user interface elements to form a composite user interface when a predetermined subset of said set of user interface elements has been received." *Croney* teaches that once "a master page is merged with an endpoint page, the resulting merged page can be transmitted to and rendered by the client system." *Croney*, col. 2, lines 23-25. Thus, all the components of the merged page are rendered. *Croney* does not mention rendering when only "a predetermined subset of said set of user interface elements has been received" as required by claim 143.

Accordingly, *Croney* neither teaches nor suggests claim 143.

III.

Claim 146 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Popp et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,046,261 (referred to herein as "*Popp*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 146 requires "carrying out processing specified data stored at each child entity, the processing comprising generating a further message for transmission to at least one of said plurality of source applications."

Popp col. 12, line 32 states that "application 214 includes objects 216" including root object 218. Thus, all objects 216 are part of application 214. *Popp* also teaches that "root object 218 sends a message to its children, objects 220A-220B, to render themselves." *Popp*, col. 12, lines 39-41.

First, *Popp* teaches that the message is sent by the "root" object 218 and <u>not</u> related to "data stored at each <u>child</u> entity" as required by claim 146.

Second, *Popp* teaches that the root object 218 sends a message to its children <u>not</u> to "at least one of said plurality of <u>source applications</u>" as required by claim 146.

Thus, for either of the foregoing reasons, *Popp* neither teaches nor suggests claim 146.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

I.

Claims 109, 120, 131 and 132 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goswami et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0205554 (referred to herein as "*Goswami*"), in view of *Croney*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 109 requires that "wherein at least some of the predetermined plurality of data items are mandatory, and at least some of the predetermined plurality of data items are optional, and the composite user interface is generated when all mandatory data items have been received."

The Office Action, p. 39 states that *Goswami* is silent with reference to the foregoing element of claim 109. The Office Action cites *Croney*, col. 2, lines 1-35 and 62-67 to supply the missing teachings. *Croney*, col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 2 states that, "The one or more requested web pages have preferably been associated with one or more master pages and one or more content endpoint pages that can be merged to form a resultant page that can be rendered by the client system to satisfy the client system request."

Thus, *Croney* teaches that "the resultant page" is rendered. There is no delineation between mandatory and optional data items to be rendered.

Croney mentions optional content, i.e.:

Once a master page is merged with an endpoint page, the resulting merged page can be transmitted to and rendered by the client system. In some embodiments, the resulting merged page includes content that is derived from multiple nested master pages. <u>In other embodiments, the resulting page includes optional master page content that is provided</u>

only in response to certain requirements being satisfied or based upon particular requirements of the client system. In yet other embodiments, the server system determines which of a plurality of master pages to use during creation of the resulting page based upon particular requirements of the client system or as otherwise determined by the server system. *Croney*, col. 2, lines 23-35.

However, *Croney*'s discussion of optional content refers to what may or may not be included in a web page. Nevertheless, regardless of what content is included in the web page, *Croney* clearly teaches that "Once a master page is merged with an endpoint page, the resulting merged page can be transmitted to and rendered by the client system." *Id*. Thus, *Croney* does not make a distinction between data items that are mandatory and optional and "the composite user interface is generated when all mandatory data items have been received." A web page transmitted for rendering by *Croney* is only transmitted when it is complete and ready for rendering by the client system.

The foregoing remarks also apply *mutatis mutandis* to claim 120 and 132.

Accordingly, *Goswami* in view of *Croney* neither teaches nor suggests claims 109, 120, and 132.

II.

Claims 133-140 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jois et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,112,242 (referred to herein as "*Jois*") in view of Menashe, U.S. Patent No. 7,216,118 (referred to herein as "*Menashe*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 133 recites in part:
    comparing each received source interface element with a plurality of predefined source interface templates; and

    if said received source interface element matches a predefined source interface template, extracting at least one user interface element for inclusion in said composite user interface.

On page 45 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that *Jois* does not teach the foregoing elements, but *Menashe*, col. 2, lines 1-10, does.

Initially, Applicants respectfully submit that *Menashe* col. 2, lines 1-10 does not discuss a "source interface element" as required by claim 133. *Menashe* is concerned with locating a desired element in a web page. To accomplish this, *Menashe* teaches developing a first sequence of elements, which can represent an ordered list of stable elements in an original document where each element is from a predetermined set of elements. *Menashe* builds a second sequence of elements, where each element in the second sequence of elements represents an ordered list of elements from the predetermined set of elements. *Menashe* does <u>not</u> teach any that the seconded sequence of elements are a "plurality of predefined source interface templates." Rather, *Menashe* teaches that the second sequence of elements are from documents and are, thus, not a "plurality of source interface templates" as required by claim 133.

Additionally, *Menashe* teaches "comparing the second sequence of elements with the one or more search queries to produce one or more comparison results." Thus, *Menashe* teaches that one or more "queries" are compared to the second sequence of elements. Each "query" is clearly not a "source interface element", and, as previously discussed, the second sequence of elements are not a "plurality of source interface elements" as required by claim 133.

Accordingly, *Jois* in view of *Menashe* does not teach or suggest claim 133.

The foregoing remarks also apply *mutatis mutandis* to claims 138 and 140.

<u>REMARKS TO THE REJECTIONS IN SECTIONS III.-IX. ARE COLLECTIVELY ADDRESSED AFTER SECTION IX.</u>

III.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 60, 61 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McNeely* in view of Francis et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,708 (referred to herein as "*Francis*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

IV.

Claims 7 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely in view of Hsu et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0193635 (referred to herein as "Hsu"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

V.

Claims 9 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely in view of Francis as applied to claims 8 and 65 above, and further in view of Koren, U.S. Patent No. 7,231,596 (referred to herein as "Koren"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

VI.

Claims 14-25 and 71-82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely in view of Popp. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

VII.

Claims 28, 29, 32-38, 85-93 and 98-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely in view of *Jois*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

VIII.

Claims 39-45, 49-55, 94 and 98-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely in view of Jois, as applied to claims 38 and 58 above, and further in view of Popp. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

IX.

Claims 110-116 and 121-127 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goswami* in view of *Croney*, as applied to claim 109 above, and further in view of Popp. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The rejections of claims in sections III-IX are of claims directly or indirectly dependent on one of independent claims 1, 58, 109, 120, and 133. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims rejected in sections III-IX are allowable for at least the same, previously discussed reasons as the independent claim upon which each dependent claim directly or indirectly depends.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

<div>

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that on April 5, 2011 this correspondence is being transmitted via the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office's electronic filing system.

/Kent B. Chambers/

</div>

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839